

Best Available Copy

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-18 have been added. Claims 1-9 and 16-18 are pending. Claims 10-15 are withdrawn from consideration.

The applicants' attorney would like to thank the Examiner for his time during the telephone conversation of May 19, 2005. During the conversation, we discussed mainly claim 1 and how it related to the cited references. No agreement was reached. However, new claims 16-18 have been added in view of our discussion.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,225,901 to Kail (Kail) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,492 to Nakamura (Nakamura) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,350 to Steen, III et al (Steen).

Kail, Nakamura, and Steen do not teach or make obvious all elements of claim 1, even in combination. Specifically, Kail does not disclose transmitting a command to get a reportable specification from the computing system to a sensor, or transmitting a reportable specification message from a sensor to the computing system. Claim 1 specifically recites that the reportable specification message informs the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. The Examiner stated that col. 3, lines 33-56, of Steen states that "sends request to update a field parameter or request for up-to-date sensor data" teaches "a reportable specification which informs the process module computing system the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor." The citation by the Examiner does teach a reportable specification which informs the process module computing system the type of data that will be provided, but instead sends a request to provide updated sensor data. This is more clearly explained in col. 8, lines 7-14, of Steen, which explains that when a "customer requests an update from the remote field unit" "new data arrives from the remote field unit." Nothing cited in Steen discloses the claimed reportable specification message that informs the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. In addition, the

invention as recited in claim 1 has the computing system send a command to the sensor to request a reportable specification that informs the computing system the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. In the cited portion of Steen the customer requests updated data, not a reportable specification that informs the computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor.

In addition, it would not be obvious to combine Kail, Nakamura, and Steen to obtain the invention, as recited in claim 1. *Ex parte Clapp* (227 USPQ 972) states that "To support the conclusion that the claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the reference." The Examiner failed to point out anything in the references that expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination. Instead, the Examiner stated that a sensor can sense multiple types of information, but the system only needs one type from the sensor, the sensor can be designated as a specific type of sensor (i.e. only sense temperature) and that this could make for a faster system since it is not required for the sensor to constantly be reformatted for each different element it can sense. The request cited by the Examiner in Steen is to update data. Such an update request does not suggest or make obvious the need to request to designate data type. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not made obvious by Kail in view of Nakamura and Steen.

Claim 2

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen, III et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,768 to Kosugi (Kosugi).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. Additionally, Kail, Nakamura, Steen and Kosugi do not teach or suggest all elements of claim 2, even in combination. Specifically, Kosugi does not disclose transmitting an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message, which informs the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor.

Kosugi teaches a fire monitoring system and fire sensor in which a receiver 100 is in communication with sensors 102 (Col. 5, line 63 to col. 6, line 2). Col. 8, lines 28-48, and col. 9, lines 18-29, of Kosugi, cited by the Examiner, does not teach that the receiver 100 transmits an acknowledgement of a reportable specification message to the sensors 102. In the cited section, the only acknowledgement signal transmitted to the sensors 102 is sent in the context of mode-switching, not an acknowledgement to reportable specifications that inform the process module computing system of the type of data that will be provided from the first sensor. For at least these reasons, claim 2 is not made obvious by the cited references.

Claim 3

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail in view of Nakamura in further view of Steen in further view of Kosugi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,123 to Sandelman et al. (Sandelman) and U.S. Patent No. 6,425,006 to Chari et al. (Chari).

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claims 1 and 2. Additionally, claim 3 recites that the alarm table designates the number of alarms, alarm identification numbers, and descriptions of the alarms. The Examiner cited col. 4, lines 23-38, of Chari as teaching this. The cited section of Chari teaches a log file which has a log of alerts that indicate information regarding alarms such as the number of an alarm, the date and time of the alarm, the source of the alarm and the category of alert. Such a log is not an alarm table that indicates the number of alarms, and descriptions of the alarms. The alarm table is a list indicating the number of alarms and an identification number for each alarm. Chari does not teach that the log provides both the number of alarms and alarm identification numbers, but only the number of an alarm (alarm identification number). Please note that the "number of alarms" (quantity of alarms) is different than "the number of an alarm" (alarm identification number). In addition, there is nothing in Chari that teaches or suggests sending such a log to a sensor. The Examiner provides justification for combining as allowing a user to view the alert log. However, this does not provide justification for sending the alarm log of Chari to the sensor, as recited in claim 3.

In paragraph 44 of the Office Action, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner cites Figure 4A of Chari as showing that a plurality of alerts can be seen, showing a log providing a

Best Available Copy

number (plurality) of alarms. The Examiner failed to state that Chari discloses "the number of alarms" (how many alarms), as recited in claim 3. For at least these reasons, claim 3 is not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Sandelman, Steen, Kosugi, and Chari.

Claims 4-9

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Sandelman, Kosugi, and Chari in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,122 to Halpern (Halpern).


Claims 4-9 each depend either directly or indirectly from the dependent claim 3, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For at least these reasons, claims 4-9 are not made obvious by Kail, Nakamura, Steen, Kosugi, Sandelman, Chari, and Halpern.

New claims 16-18 have been added and are not anticipated or made obvious by the cited references.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Michael Lee
Registration No. 31,486

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (650) 961-8300